



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,901	04/08/2005	John P. Peeters	29343-00001	9490

59582 7590 03/03/2008  
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC  
38525 WOODWARD AVENUE  
SUITE 2000  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-2970

EXAMINER
----------

MEHMOOD, JENNIFER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/03/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/530,901	Applicant(s) PEETERS, JOHN P.	
	Examiner Jennifer A. Mehmood	Art Unit 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-34 and 38-64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 35-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/13/07; 4/8/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Claims 30-34 and 38-64 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on January 16, 2008. Accordingly, this restriction is made final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 25 recites the limitation "said RFID" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727) and further in view of and Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609).

For claim 1, Nelson discloses a diagnostics system comprising: a flexible patch having an adhesive portion and adapted to be positioned on a surface (col 3, Ins 5-10; col 4, Ins 51-54; Fig. 1a, item 20; Fig. 2, items 24 and 26); a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag (Fig. 1a, item 22) and said patch and having an antenna (col 6, Ins 40-46; Fig. 4), an RFID electronic chip (col 6, Ins 8-21; Fig. 2, item 22), said RFID tag and responding to a stimulus by wirelessly transmitting and receiving, through the use of said antenna, signals that correspond to said stimulus; and a wireless RFID reader adapted to communicate with said RFID tag, said RFID reader being adapted to communicate over a network (col 6, Ins 40-55; col 8, Ins 37-46; col 9, Ins 1-5; Figs. 7a and 7b). Nelson, however, does not disclose a sensor module integrated with said patch. Crowley, on the other hand, discloses a sensor module integrated with a patch (col 7, Ins 20-34; col 10, Ins 10-15; Fig. 1, items 40 and 54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to include a sensor module on a patch so that specific information of a patient, such as temperature, is obtained in order to make the most appropriate patient diagnosis. Nelson also does not disclose that a reader communicates through the use of multiple protocols with said RFID tag. Lu, however, discloses a reader which communicates through the use of multiple protocols with a RFID tag (col 1, Ins 49-55; col 2, Ins 37-47). It would have been obvious to communicate through the use of multiple protocols with a

RFID tag so that a single reader is used to communicate with multiple tags, thereby providing an efficient system.

For claim 2, Nelson discloses a substantial portion of said RFID tag is integrated onto a substrate disk (Fig. 2, item 24; col 4, lns 51-53). However, Nelson does not disclose a sensor. Furthermore, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 as stated above regarding the sensor disclosed by Crowley. It would have been obvious to include the sensor disclosed by Crowley integrated with the disk disclosed by Nelson so that a single medium includes both the sensor and the tag in order to decrease material costs by having two objects located on the same medium.

For claim 3, Nelson discloses said substrate disk includes a protective layer attached thereto (Fig. 2, items 24 and 26), said protective layer being in direct contact with the surface when said patch is positioned on the surface (col 4, lns 51-67; col 5, lns 25).

For claim 4, Nelson discloses said protective layer is formed of a semi-permeable material (col 4, lns 56-67; col 5, lns 1-8), but Nelson does not disclose that the layer is adapted to react to said stimulus from said surface. Crowley, however, discloses a sensor integrated with a layer that is adapted to react to said stimulus from a surface (i.e. body temperature of a human or animal; col 4, lns 32-67; col 5, lns 15-23). It would have been obvious to include the protective layer of Nelson adapted to react to said stimulus from a surface as disclosed by Crowley so that specific

characteristics of a human or animal are obtained to make the most appropriate diagnosis in a medical environment.

For claim 8, Nelson discloses a tag placed on a surface, but does not disclose a stimulus sensing of a surface. Crowley, however, discloses stimulus sensing includes sensing electrical, chemical, biological, and physical elements of said surface (col 1, lns 5-11). It would have been obvious to include stimulus sensing of a surface so that parameters of a patient's skin are measured in a non-intrusive manner (col 1, lns 49-58), as disclosed by Crowley.

For claim 9, Nelson discloses said RFID reader, but does not specifically disclose that the reader is selected from the group consisting of a cellular telephone, a personal digital assistant, a beeper, and a computer. Crowley, discloses an RFID reader as a PDA (Fig. 5, item 10; col 7, lns 50-60). It would have been obvious to have the reader as disclosed by Nelson incorporated into a PDA, as disclosed by Crowley, so that the reader is mobile and will read several tags in multiple locations.

For claim 10, Nelson discloses said surface is the skin surface of a person (col 2, lns 60-65; col 4, lns 65-67; col 5, lns 1-8).

For claim 11, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 as stated above, regarding the sensor module. In addition, Nelson discloses said RFID tag further comprises a power unit adapted to stabilize voltage within said RFID tag (col 6, lns 26-48).

For claim 13, Nelson discloses an RFID tag, but does not disclose an RFID tag and sensor formed as an integrated circuit (IC). Crowley, however, discloses an RFID

tag and sensor formed as an integrated circuit (IC – col 5, lns 15-20; col 6, lns 46-51). It would have been obvious to include both an RFID tag and sensor formed as an IC so that a patient easily wears the RFID tag and sensor in one location on the patient's body.

For claim 19, Nelson discloses said patch is disposable (col 5 lns 26-32).

For claim 20, Nelson discloses said RFID tag further includes a power generation module that powers said RFID tag (col 6, lns 26-39). While Nelson discloses powering said RFID tag, Nelson does not disclose an RFID tag sensor. Crowley, on the other hand, discloses powering an RFID tag sensor (col 6, lns 5-14; col 8, lns 13-15). It would have been obvious to include a power source for a RFID tag sensor so that the sensor produces and stores readings of the sensor for future reference.

For claim 21, Nelson discloses said network includes a remote interrogator RFID reader (col 6, lns 7-21). However, Nelson discloses neither storage nor data processing adapted to remotely store and analyze data read. Crowley, however, does disclose storage and data processing that is remotely read by a reader (Fig. 1, items 8, 18, and 22; col 8, lns 34-42). It would have been obvious to include storage and data processing with the reader disclosed by Nelson so that the transponder maintains a relatively small size by transmitting raw data to the reader.

7. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609) and further in view of Ikefuji (US 5,774,062).

For claim 5, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 as stated above, regarding the sensor. In addition, Nelson discloses said RFID tag comprises: and a controller communicative with an interface, said controller (RFID interrogator – col 5, Ins 42-67; col 10, Ins 37-56) having a memory with a data table being adapted to analyze said data within said RFID tag (Fig. 7b, items 52; col 7, Ins 35-45; col 8, Ins 37-47). Nelson, however, does not include a sensor interface having an analog to digital converter coupled to at least one sensor. Ikefuji, on the other hand, discloses a sensor interface having an analog to digital converter coupled to at least one sensor (Fig. 1, item 18; Fig. 6, A/D; col 8, Ins 10-15). It would have been obvious to include an analog digital converter coupled to the sensor of Crowley and interfaced with the controller of Nelson so that an abundant amount of information from the sensor is sent back to the interrogator/reader of Nelson via digital signals so that a diagnosis is made in a timely manner.

For claim 6, Nelson discloses said controller stores an ID number in a data table (col 5, Ins 42-67; Fig. 1a, item 52; col 7, Ins 35-45). Nelson, however, does not disclose a sensor. Crowley, on the other hand, discloses a sensor (col 7, Ins 20-34; col 10, Ins 10-15; Fig. 1, items 40 and 54). It would have been obvious to include a sensor ID number in the data table disclosed by Nelson in order to distinguish among several sensors that sense different types of characteristics of a patient.

For claim 7, Nelson discloses a tag communicative with said controller, but Nelson does not disclose a temperature sensor. Crowley, however, discloses a temperature sensor (col 1, Ins 5-11). It would have been obvious to include a



temperature sensor integrated with the tag disclosed by Nelson so that a patient's temperature is measured in a non-intrusive manner.

8. Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609). and further in view of Valletta (US 6,970,105).

For claim 12, Nelson discloses a patch, but does not disclose a micro knife. Valletta, on the other hand, discloses a micro knife located on a patch adapted to dispense a substance when said patch is pressed on said surface, where said surface is the skin of the person (col 1, lns 43-49; col 3, lns 31-40; Fig. 2, items 13, 18, 29). While Valletta does not specifically disclose that the micro knife (syringe) is used to draw blood from the surface of the skin, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known that the syringe may used to draw blood from the surface of the skin as well as apply a therapy as disclosed by Valletta. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to draw blood from a patch worn by a patient in order to closely monitor blood characteristics of a patient thereby providing the most appropriate treatment.

For claim 16, Nelson does not disclose a cardiac sensor. Valletta, on the other hand, discloses a cardiac sensor (col 1, lns 47-50; col 3, lns 1-5). It would have been obvious to detect cardiac throbs via a patch worn by a patient in order to closely monitor the heart rate of a patient to determine exercise limitations of a patient.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609). and further in view of Forcier et al. (US 7,061,381).

Nelson does not disclose a glucose sensor. Forcier discloses a glucose sensor (Fig. 9; col 11, Ins 65-67; col 12, Ins 1-10). It would have been obvious to modify the RFID tag of Nelson to include a glucose sensor disclosed by Forcier so that a patient is alerted to dangerous blood sugar levels.

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609).  
and further in view of Quinn et al. (US 2005/0101843).

Nelson does not disclose a radiation sensor. Quinn, however, discloses a radiation sensor (Fig. 1, items 20, 24; parag 0016). It would have been obvious to modify the RFID tag of Nelson to include a radiation sensor disclosed by Quinn so that a patient is alerted to dangerous levels of radiation.

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609).  
and further in view of Townsend et al. (US 6,529,127).

Nelson discloses an RFID tag, but does not disclose an RFID stress sensor. Townsend, however, discloses RF tag and sensor module includes at least one attachment point that enables attachment of the RF tag and sensor module to a structural stress, thereby forming a RF stress sensor (col 1, Ins 25-47; col 2, Ins 50-67; col 4, Ins 8-27; Fig. 1, items 20a-20n). It would have been obvious to modify the RFID tag of Nelson to include a structural stress sensor disclosed by Townsend so that the integrity of a structure is maintained and confirmed as safe.

12. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609) and further in view of Ghazarian (US 7,034,683).

Nelson discloses a reader, but does not disclose that the reader includes a processor adapted to analyze and geolocate said patch through the use of GPS. Ghazarian, however, discloses a reader that includes a processor adapted to analyze and geolocate said patch through the use of GPS (Fig. 1A, items 32, 40, and GPS; col 10, lns 37-50; col 17, lns 49-55). It would have been obvious to incorporate a GPS receiver as disclosed by Ghazarian into the reader disclosed by Nelson so that a tag or patch's location is accounted for at all times, such as during inventory control, tracking of individuals, etc..

13. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609) and further in view of Lye et al. (US 2004/0100376).

Nelson discloses an RFID tag, but does not disclose a RFID sensor module integrated into an immunoassay testing strip. Lye, however, discloses a RFID sensor module integrated into an immunoassay testing strip (Fig. 3, item 12; parags 0164 and 0165). It would have been obvious to include a RFID tag sensor module integrated into an immunoassay testing strip so that particular antigens are detected and communicated to a remote location for pharmaceutical purposes.

14. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, Jr. (US 6,297,727), Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609) and further in view of Valletta (US 6,970,105) and Lye et al. (US 2004/0100376).

Nelson discloses a patch with a substrate, but does not disclose said patch having a sample input port enabling migration of an analyte by capillary forces; and at least one testing area integrated with said substrate area and adapted to capture antigens that flow through said testing area. Valetta discloses a sample input port enabling migration of an analyte by capillary forces; and at least one testing area integrated with said substrate area and adapted to capture data that flow through said testing area. While Valletta discloses capturing data that flow through said testing area, Valletta does not disclose that antigens flow through said testing area. Lye, however, discloses capturing data pertaining to antigens flowing through said testing area (parags. 0148, 0159, 0164, and 0165). It would have been obvious to modify the patch disclosed by Nelson with capturing data with an input port disclosed by Valletta, specifically focusing on capturing data pertaining to antigens disclosed by Lye so that data of a patient is captured and stored for future reference, such as data deviating from a predetermined range.

15. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley (US 7,142,114) and further in view of Lu et al. (US 6,172,609).

Crowley discloses a human diagnostics system comprising: a patch having a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag and sensor module (col 1, Ins 6-11; col 6, Ins 38-51), and being attachable to the surface of the skin and adapted to sense

predetermined elements through the skin and transmit signals corresponding to said predetermined elements (col 4, Ins 36-50); a RFID reader communicative with said patch through the use of a network (col 10, Ins 37-40) and adapted to analyze, receive, and transmit the signals from said patch (col 8, Ins 34-41; Fig. 1, items 10, 18, and 22) through the use of multiple protocols; and a remote storage and data unit communicative with said RFID reader (Figs. 1 and 5, item 10), said remote storage and data unit analyzing and storing data from said patch and said RFID (col 7, In 15), said remote storage and data unit transmitting said analyzed and stored data to said RFID reader through the use of said network (single reader for plurality of measurements/sensor tags downloaded to a database - col 10, Ins 28-40). Crowley, however, does not disclose a RFID reader communicating to a tag through the use of multiple protocols. Lu, on the other hand, discloses a RFID reader communicating to a tag through the use of multiple protocols (col 1, Ins 49-55; col 2, Ins 37-47). It would have been obvious to communicate through the use of multiple protocols with a RFID tag so that a single reader is used to communicate with multiple tags, thereby providing an efficient system.

For claim 26, Crowley discloses a remote wireless device (Fig. 5, item 10) adapted to remotely access said predetermined elements sensed by said RFID tag and sensor module (col 7, Ins 21-37; col 8, Ins 34-49).

For claim 27, Crowley discloses said predetermined elements include electrical, chemical, biological, and physical elements of a person (col 1, Ins 5-11).

16. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609) and further in view of Zeps et al. (US 6,937,154).

For claim 28, Crowley discloses a wireless network, but does not disclose communicating through the use of a communication protocol including, Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, Broadband, WLAN, and 3G. However, Zeps discloses communicating through the use of a communication protocol including, Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, Broadband, WLAN, and 3G (Fig. 1; col 9, Ins 30-67; col 10, Ins 33-42). It would have been obvious to communicate through the use of a communication protocol so that numerous equipment communicates with one another via a standardized communication channel.

For claim 29, Crowley discloses an RFID reader as a mobile, portable device, but does not disclose the RFID reader as a cellular telephone. Zeps, however, discloses the RFID reader as a cellular telephone (Fig. 1, items 31 and 34; col 3, Ins 33-45). It would have been obvious to design the reader as a cellular telephone so that the reader is used for multiple purposes such as interrogating transponders and communicating with another during an emergency.

17. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley (US 7,142,114) and Townsend et al. (US 6,529,127) and further in view of Lu et al. (US 6,172,609).

For claim 35, Crowley discloses a diagnostics system comprising: a patch having an adhesive portion and adapted to be attached to a structure; a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag (Fig. 1, item 40; col 7, Ins 20-30; col 9, Ins 20-28) and sensor

module having an integrated temperature module (Fig. 1, item 54), said RFID tag and sensor module being integrated with said patch and having an antenna (Fig. 1, item 42; col 9, lns 22-30) and at least one sensor, said RFID tag and sensor module responding to a stimulus by wirelessly transmitting and receiving, through the use of said antenna, signals that correspond to said stimulus; and a wireless RFID reader communicative with said RFID tag and sensor module (col 7, lns 27-34; col 10, lns 10-19), said reader being adapted to communicate over a network (col 10, lns 35-40). Crowley discloses a patch disposed on a surface and not embedded within a structure. Townsend, however discloses a patch embedded within a structure (col 4, lns 8-15; Fig. 1, items 20a-20n). It would have been obvious to dispose a patch within a structure as opposed to on the surface of a structure in order to determine low cost health monitoring of a structure as disclosed by Townsend (col 3, lns 44-54). In addition, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 25 as stated above regarding Lu disclosing communications between a tag and a reader using multiple protocols.

For claim 36, Crowley discloses the stimulus of body temperature and not a defect in a structure. Townsend, on the other hand, discloses determining a defect in a structure (col 1, lns 11-26; col 3, lns 45-48). It would have been obvious to determine a defect in a structure in order to determine low cost health monitoring of a structure as disclosed by Townsend (col 3, lns 44-54).

18. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley (US 7,142,114), Townsend et al. (US 6,529,127) and Lu et al. (US 6,172,609) and further in view of Lake et al. (US 2001/0004237).

Crowley does not disclose that the stimulus is the presence of insects within a structure. Lake, however, discloses detecting the presence of insects within a structure (parags 0035 and 0036; Fig. 6, item 100, 20, and 22). It would have been obvious to determine the presence of insects within a structure in order to limit the amount of pesticide utilized to destroy insects since the location of insect infestation is known.

### ***Conclusion***

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A Mehmood whose telephone number is (571) 272.2976. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. George Bugg, can be reached at (571) 272.2998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.



Application/Control Number:  
10/530,901  
Art Unit: 2612

Page 16

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer A. Mehmood  
February 21, 2008

George Buqa / Primary Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Buqa". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "G" and a cursive "Buqa".